

in imminent danger, we do not need to worry about endangered species any more.

Another area in jeopardy concerns global warming. Despite the clear consensus of the international scientific community, some politicians are disputing the role that chemicals such as chlorofluorocarbons have in the depletion of the ozone layer. Unbelievably, we have leaders on the Republican side of the aisle who claim they know more about the threat to the Earth's ozone layer than Nobel prize-winning scientists and who are working to repeal bans on these harmful chemicals. Is this how public policy is supposed to be made? Certainly not.

What seems to underlie all these environmental attacks is the false assumption that a strong economy and a clean environment are natural enemies. Because the vast majority of Americans do not support their attack and the facts do not back their arguments up, the proponents of these rollbacks have to resort to polarizing the debate into a choice between jobs and environmental stewardship.

Well, my colleagues, do not be fooled. A strong environment and a strong economy go hand-in-hand.

I come from an area in New York that borders Long Island Sound. The people I am privileged to represent in New York know first-hand that pollution-based prosperity is short-sighted and ends up costing more than it gives back. That is why business leaders, labor groups, and environmental organizations in New York and Connecticut have come together and are working in unison to restore the ecological health of the Sound. With the help of the EPA and the Federal rules it enforces, Long Island Sound is slowly coming back to life. Now is not the time to turn back the clock.

Many in this Chamber like to talk about the importance of learning from history, lest we repeat the mistakes of the past. Well, history around the world has clearly shown that there is a high price to be paid for abandoning environmental stewardship.

Mr. Speaker, what it all comes down to is a choice between the philosophy of Teddy Roosevelt—a Republican, I remind you—and James Watt. One saw the wisdom of preserving nature's beauty for future generations, the other sought to sell off national parks to the highest bidder.

The American people know who is right. It is high time that Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership wake up and recognize this too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REPUBLICAN CUTS HURT THE ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my dismay at the devastating cuts to the environment and environmental programs that my Republican colleagues are really shoving through this Congress. Without question, these cuts will spoil our Nation's water, air, and land.

I am delighted to join my colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], in listening to her comments, and I applaud my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], who is organizing people tonight to speak on this issue. I commend him for his leadership on environmental policy.

I am pleased to join my colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] also in sponsoring legislation for the cleanup of Long Island Sound.

□ 1930

This is one of our real concerns about what is happening with regard to the environment, and without question, the cuts, as I said, will spoil our Nation's water, air, and our land.

Americans can take great pride in the progress that we have made over the years in cleaning up our Nation's environment.

But Republicans, the Republican majority, are really turning back the clock. They are wiping out decades of improvement to the environment and giving polluters a license to pollute. They are not achieving this through open debate where we could have a back and forth on these issues, but they are doing it through funding cuts that are hidden in massive spending bills that the Congress is taking up.

I also want to commend my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle who, in fact, have stood up to the pressure and turned back legislation that is harmful to the environment. Time and again, this year and over the decade, Democrats and Republicans have come together in a spirit of bipartisanship to protect the environment. That has been true over and over again in our Nation's history, and unfortunately that kind of bipartisanship is being rent and pulled apart. Despite the bipartisan efforts, the Republican majority is taking a wrecking ball to environmental protections in this country.

More than \$1.5 billion will be slashed from the Environmental Protection Agency's budget next year. Slashing EPA's budget by more than 20 percent will cripple the agency's ability to ensure that our water is safe to drink and our air is safe to breathe. The Federal Superfund Program, which cleans up our Nation's worst hazardous waste dumps, will be cut by nearly \$300 million in 1996. This is another 20 percent cut from current spending levels. In my

own congressional district, the Superfund has been responsible for clearing up the Raymark Superfund site. From 1919 to 1984, Raymark Industries spewed asbestos, lead, dioxins, and PCB's throughout Stratford, CT. The homes of neighborhood families and local businesses as well as the parks where children play and the schools they all attend were all severely contaminated by this toxic waste, and now, due to Superfund, this site may soon become clean enough to develop as a retail shopping center. As a matter of fact, there is a developer who is ready to put in a \$50 million project in this area.

EPA's work at Raymark is a wonderful success story in the making, and working with State and local officials, the EPA has been effective, efficient, and responsive, and I might add the State has been effective, efficient, and responsive, as well as the local community and the local government. Their tireless efforts have made Raymark the Nation's model for accomplishing the cleanup work that Superfund was designed to do.

Do my Republican colleagues really believe that Americans would rather balance the budget than clean up toxic waste in American communities? Look at any child, look them in the face and explain this to them. The question is, as the President has done this evening in vetoing the budget, which, I might add, 60 percent of the American public wanted him to veto the budget because of what was being done in Medicare, Medicaid, the environment, turning the clock back on environmental legislation, and in tax fairness to working Americans; the public does not want to see the budget balanced under any set of circumstances and giving up our principles and giving up the movement forward we have made in these areas.

Let us have individual votes on environmental cuts. Then Americans will truly understand what this new majority in the Congress stands for. I urge my colleagues to vote against spending bills that contain environmental cuts.

EXPRESSING CONCERN ABOUT DEPLOYMENT OF TROOPS TO BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my concerns with respect to policies on the deployment of troops in Bosnia.

This past year this Congress has experienced many highs in the legislative process. However, at this moment, I have a great sense of frustration with the current policies of deploying ground troops in Bosnia. We have spoken out on several occasions, and I would like to reiterate here what has occurred here on the floor of the House of Representatives over the past several weeks.

Several weeks ago we had a resolution before the House at the time, which passed this House, which said to the President that he should not be committing our troops to Bosnia or that the peace process should not be based on the assumption that we would promise to send ground troops to Bosnia. That passed this House by a significant majority.

Shortly thereafter, several days or a week later, we had a second resolution expressing our concern that we should not deploy troops to Bosnia without the President coming before the Congress and making that appropriate request. Neither of these resolutions have been adhered to by our President.

As we stand here this evening, we know that troops have already been deployed, and, in my opinion, we have put the cart before the horse. We have sent troops to Bosnia, ground troops, without having established the compelling interests and the necessary reasons why we should be deploying troops to that area of conflict of the world.

My great concerns primarily rest with the fact that it seems to me that the real reason why we have troops in that area of the world at this moment is because of a relatively casual off-hand promise made by our President over a year ago which, in fact, committed that if a peace accord were subsequently to be reached, that he, in fact, would enforce that peace accord with the use of American troops, risking putting our troops in harm's way. The problem with such a policy on such a serious issue is that the promise was made before a peace accord was reached. The promise was made without the benefits of knowing the full extent of that peace accord, without knowing the serious risks involved with deploying troops in that area, because the peace accord had not yet been formulated and without knowing how sincere the parties were to actually going forth with these peace missions.

The problem with such a policy is obvious to me and certainly obvious, I believe, to the American people, as it should be. Never should we risk or commit our troops by way of a promise by our President or any President to anyplace in the world before, in fact, we know the full extent of the peace accord reached or any other accord on which we are basing the deployment of troops. It is foolhardy, in my opinion.

Such foreign policy must be avoided in the future, and we must, therefore, today stress our strong stand in opposition to the deployment of ground troops to Bosnia. It is not enough, in my opinion, to say there is a compelling American interest. That does not make a compelling American interest so. We have not heard, in my opinion, at least, the real reasons why there is a need to deploy troops to that very dangerous area.

I would like to just relate to what has occurred by way of some 40 or so years of history in the region of the

world. I have little doubt, and I certainly am hopeful that with the deployment of troops in that area, there will come some stability amongst the fighting factions in that area. We can certainly look at the recent history to see that that will probably be the case.

In recent years, under communist rule, we have not had the civil discord and the fighting and warring factions that have occurred in the last 3½ years. That is not by way of coincidence. It took the presence of force, military force, and a forceful hand to maintain stability in that area. Similarly, I think the introduction of American troops into that area for this limited time may very well create an atmosphere of some civility for the time the troops are there.

The policy is already that these troops will be removed in a year. We are hearing now the President even saying perhaps these troops can be removed and brought home in 7 months. It suggests to me the real reason that these troops were deployed there was simply to do face-saving based upon a political promise or a promise that was made we would use our troops. I do not believe our President had any alternative once that promise was made, and it is unfortunate, because I think our troops are really being deployed there as a face-saving technique to the world to justify the promise that was made over a year ago, and that to me is the weakest of reasons why we should have troops in harm's way.

Let me also say that the arguments advanced by the White House a week ago sounded very similar to arguments advanced in the early stages of the Vietnam War. The arguments advanced in the early stages of the Vietnam War were that we had a commitment to try to preserve civility in the area of Vietnam, that we had a commitment at that time to protect that area. This argument certainly falls short even today.

In closing, let me just say, finally, there is no national interest, and I would support our troops enough, Mr. Speaker, that we do everything possible to bring them home as soon as we can.

CONFRONTING OUR NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House this evening to inform the House that as of this afternoon at 3 o'clock, the bureau of public debt has reported our national debt is now \$4,988,766,009,862.29.

Interestingly enough, it is actually a decrease from yesterday to today of about \$125,665,000.

But I point this out again to call attention to the fact that the preeminent issue now confronting this Congress is that for the first time in 60 years we are seriously questioning our need to

address the elimination of the deficits which have led to the debt, which is now approaching \$5 trillion. One of the reasons that I am appearing on the House floor this evening, and I intend to continue to try to appear each day until we can come to some consensus on a 7-year balanced budget, is because I think we have lost sight of the problem we are seeking to solve, and I want to call on the combined efforts of all of us, Republicans and Democrats, to find a way to bridge the gap between us on the issue of how we once and for all balance the Federal budget.

It is interesting to me that, and again Members of Congress are known for sending out news releases, and certainly I am no exception, but, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that I have a policy in my office where I really try not to send a release out to the news media unless we actually have something concrete to say. When we began several days ago obtaining the national debt figure every afternoon, I began a program, using the fax machine, to inform the media in my district. It is interesting, and I think it says a lot about the difficult challenge that we face in dealing with the public, that there is an opinion column today in one of the newspapers in my district that actually questions my informing the public about the national debt, in fact, suggests it is a waste of Government money and a waste of my time.

I want to read from the opinion piece. He said, "I got a new twist on," in his words, "the tax waste watch this week when Congressman Longley sent us a single-page fax proclaiming the daily debt watch." He says, "Golly, I hope he watches more than that each day."

I would suggest to the news media that this is probably the single most important thing we need to watch every day is that we have got to finally, once and for all, put an end to the national deficits that have built up almost to a \$5 trillion debt.

Again, to put this debt into perspective, with Federal spending under any of the plans being debated in this Congress, ranging between \$12 trillion and \$13 trillion over the next 7 years, \$5 trillion are existing debt, money which has already been spent for programs, is almost 40 percent of the total amount of money that the Federal Government will spend in the next 7 years.

Furthermore, when you look at our annual interest payments alone, of almost \$250 billion, that amount of money dwarfs the difference in spending priorities between the Republicans and the Democrats in the House. Or, if you will, if you say there is about a \$15 billion or \$20 billion difference in what we propose for spending in fiscal year 1996, \$250 billion in interest payments, minus the \$20 billion difference means that we could preserve every nickel that we are currently spending on every program in Washington and have a \$230 billion surplus on top of that. This ought to bring to the attention of